

CROWELL & MORING LLP

IOOI PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2595 (202) 624-2500 FACSIMILE (202) 628-5116

043:smd 01215.010

ROBERT M. HALPERIN (202) 624-2543 rhalperin@cromor.com

SUITE 1200 2010 MAIN STREET IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92814-7217 (949) 263-8400 FACSIMILE (949) 263-8414

IBO FLEET STREET

LONDON EC4A 2HD 44-171-413-0011

November 30, 2000

BY HAND

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 Twelfth Street, S.W. Room TW-A325 Washington, DC 20554

Re:

In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45 and Rural Task Force Recommendation to the Federal-State Joint Board, FCC OOJ-3

Dear Ms. Salas:

Transmitted herewith on behalf of the State of Alaska are an original and four (4) copies of the "Reply Comments of the State of Alaska" for filing in the above-referenced docket.

In the event there are any questions concerning this matter, please communicate with the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

Robert M. Halperin

Enclosures

cc: Sheryl Todd (3 copies)

International Transcription Service, Inc. (1 diskette copy)

Participation of 4 Lead School

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION RECEIVEL Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of

Federal-State Joint Board on
Universal Service

Rural Task Force Recommendation
to the Federal-State Joint Board

REPLY COMMENTS OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

The State of Alaska ("Alaska" or "the State") submits these brief reply comments to address a single issue: is access charge reform for rural telephone companies necessary for interexchange carriers ("IXCs") to continue to comply with the statutory and regulatory requirements for rate integration? The answer most assuredly is that the requirements for rate integration must be followed, even if access charge reform for rural telephone companies is not implemented.

AT&T says that access charges in areas served by rural telephone companies must be reformed if long distance carriers are to be able to continue to comply with rate integration requirements. It believes that some regional long distance competitors will be in a position to charge lower rates because their access costs will be lower than those of national carriers. National IXCs, it alleges, will then lose

See 47 U.S.C. § 254(g); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1801(b).

customers in low-cost areas to lower priced regional rivals.² AT&T therefore urges the FCC to reform rural carriers' access charges as quickly as possible.

The State takes no position on whether the access charge reforms proposed by the Rural Task Force ("RTF") should be implemented, but the requirements for rate integration must be followed even if those reforms are not implemented.

Indeed, as a legal matter, the Commission has previously determined that rate integration and geographic rate averaging are not dependent on access charge reform. AT&T previously sought to delay implementation of these requirements until after access charges were reduced and more cost based. The Commission rejected that suggestion stating that Congress was fully aware of geographic differences in access charges when it adopted Section 254(g), and nonetheless required the Commission to adopt rules implementing that statutory provision within six months.³

Even if regional IXCs face lower access charges – a fact that has not been established – nationwide IXCs have other cost advantages over regional carriers, such as the ability to take advantage of more efficient national advertising, and the

² AT&T Comments at 6.

Policy and Rules Concerning the Interstate Interexchange Marketplace, Implementation of Section 254(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 9564, 9583 at ¶¶ 41, 52 (1996). Smaller, regional carriers argued that they should be relieved from complying with rate integration requirements because they faced higher costs. The FCC rejected the argument as well. Id. at ¶ 53.

ability to use their own networks throughout the country, rather than having to purchase services or facilities from other carriers.

In short, regardless of whether rural telephone company access charges are reformed, rate integration – and geographic rate averaging – remain statutory and regulatory requirements to which all providers of interstate interexchange service must adhere.

Respectfully submitted,

THE STATE OF ALASKA

Robert M. Halperin

CROWELL & MORING LLP

1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202/624-2543

Attorneys for the State of Alaska

Of Counsel:

John W. Katz, Esquire Special Counsel to the Governor Director, State-Federal Relations Office of the State of Alaska Suite 336 444 North Capitol Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001

November 30, 2000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 30th day of November 2000, a copy of the foregoing Reply Comments of The State of Alaska was served by hand and/or first-class mail on the following:

The Honorable Susan Ness Commissioner, FCC Joint Board Chair Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W., Rm. 8-B115H Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Harold Furchtgott-Roth Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W., Rm. 8-B115H Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Gloria Tristani Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W., Rm. 8-B115H Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Laska Schoenfelder Commissioner, State Joint Board Chair South Dakota Public Utilities Commission State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Street Pierre, SD 57501-5070

The Honorable Martha Hogerty Public Counsel Missouri Office of Public Counsel 301 West High St., Suite 250 Truman Building, P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

The Honorable Bob Rowe Commissioner Montana Public Service Commission 1701 Prospect Avenue P.O. Box 202601 Helena, MT 59620-2601 The Honorable Patrick H. Wood, III Chairman Texas Public Utility Commission 1701 North Congress Avenue P.O. Box 13326 Austin, TX 78711-3326

The Honorable Nanette G. Thompson Chair Regulatory Commission of Alaska 1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 400 Anchorage, AK 99501-1693

Greg Fogleman Economic Analyst Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Gerald Gunter Bldg. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Mary E. Newmeyer Federal Affairs Advisor Alabama Public Service Commission 100 N. Union Street, Ste. 800 Montgomery, AL 36104

Joel Shifman Senior Advisor Maine Public Utilities Commission 242 State Street State House Station 18 Augusta, ME 04333-0018

Peter Bluhm Director of Policy Research Vermont Public Service Board Drawer 20 112 State St., 4th Floor Montpieller, VT 05620-2701 Charlie Bolle Policy Advisor Nevada Public Utilities Commission 1150 E. Williams Street Carson City, NV 89701-3105

Carl Johnson Telecom Policy Analyst New York Public Service Commission 3 Empire State Plaza Albany, NY 12223-1350

Lori Kenyon Common Carrier Specialist Regulatory Commission of Alaska 1016 West 6th Ave., Suite 400 Anchorage, AK 99501

Susan Stevens Miller Assistant General Counsel Maryland Public Service Commission 16th Floor, 6 Paul Street Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Tom Wilson
Economist
Washington Utilities & Transportation
Commission
1300 Evergreen Park Drive, S.W.
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Philip McClelland Senior Assistant Consumer Advocate PA Office of Consumer Advocate 555 Walnut Street Forum Place, 5th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923 Barbara Meisenheimer Consumer Advocate Missouri Office of Public Counsel 301 West High St., Suite 250 Truman Building P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Earl Poucher Legislative Analyst Office of the Public Counsel 111 West Madison, Rm. 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Ann Dean Assistant Director Maryland Public Service Commission 16th Floor, 6 Paul Street Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

David Dowds
Public Utilities Supervisor
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oaks Blvd.
Gerald Gunter Bldg.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Rowland Curry Chief Engineer Texas Public Uility Commission 1701 North Congress Avenue P.O. Box 13326 Austin, TX 78701-3326

haron M. Davis

Sharon M. Davis